DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 139 EA 016 234

AUTHOR Seaberg, John J., Jr.; Ramirez, Ernest E.
TITLE Interpersonal Behavior and Leader Behavior Characteristics of Business Administration and Educational Administration Graduate Students.
PUB DATE 12 Apr 83
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavioral Science Research; *Behavior Rating Scales; Interaction; Interpersonal Competence; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Leadership; Personality Traits; Statistical Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *FIRO B Scale; Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation; *Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire; Schutz (William); Stogdill (R M)

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the relationship between interpersonal behaviors and leader behaviors for present and prospective leaders in business administration and educational administration. Interpersonal behavior characteristics are measured by Schutz' FIRO-B (Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation--Behavior) Scales, while leader behavior characteristics are measured by Stogdill's Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire XII. Populations consist of business administration graduate students and educational administration graduate students enrolled in the College of Business Administration and Education in a large (urban) southwestern state-supported university. Samples consisted of 83 business administration and 71 educational administration students; 106 were males, 48 were females. "Expressed Inclusion" was the most powerful leader behavior for the 154 respondents, for it was significantly related to 8 of 12 leader behavior characteristics. The least powerful predictors of leader behavior characteristics were "Expressed Affection" and "Wanted Affection." The findings demonstrate that "Expressed Inclusion" and "Wanted Inclusion" must be satisfied first before a person takes care of "Control" and "Affection." Tables are included in an appendix. (Author/TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John J. Seaberg, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED238139

Interpersonal Behavior and Leader Behavior Characteristics of Business Administration and Educational Administration Graduate Students

John J. Seaberg, Jr.
University of Oklahoma

and

Ernest E. Ramirez
Villanova University

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, April 12, 1983.

"Printed in U.S.A."

EA 016 234

INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIORS AND LEADER BEHAVIORS

This paper examines the results of a study that was conducted on the relationship between interpersonal behaviors and leader behaviors. The conclusions of Schutz (1958, 1966) were used by the investigators in identifying and explaining the construct of interpersonal behavior. Schutz's (1966) dimensions of inclusion, control, and affection were used in the study. The conclusions of Stogdill (1974) were used by the investigators in identifying and explaining the construct of leader behavior. Stogdill's (1963) dimensions of representation, reconciliation, persuasion, role assumption, predictive accuracy, integration, superior orientation, tolerance of uncertainty, initiating structure, tolerance of freedom, consideration, and production emphasis were used in the study. The research question in the study was as follows: Are the three interpersonal behavior scores of Inclusion, Control, and Affection as measured by Schutz's (1977) Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B) Scales related to the 12 leader behavior scores of Representation, Reconciliation, Persuasion, Role Assumption, Predictive Accuracy, Integration, Superior Orientation, Tolerance of Uncertainty, Initiating Structure, Tolerance of Freedom, Consideration, and Production Emphasis as measured by Stogdill's (1963) Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ)-XII?

PROCEDURES

Respondents in the study were graduate students of a large, southwestern State University who were majoring in business administration and educational administration during the early 1980s. Respondents were selected by means of incidental sampling as defined by Guilford and Fruchter (1973). There were 154 respondents;

83 business administration majors and 71 educational administration majors. By gender, there were 48 female respondents and 106 male respondents.

The data generated by the respondents were analyzed initially by means of bivariate statistical analyses, namely, Pearson correlational analyses. The relationships between FIRO-B and LBDQ Scales were analyzed for (a) 154 respondents; (b) 83 business administration majors; and (c) 71 educational administration majors. The statistically significant r's for each of the stated groups are listed in Tables 1,2, and 3.

Multiple linear regression analyses using the SPSS computer program were accomplished using Initiating Structure and Consideration (the two basic leader behavior dimensions according to Stogdill) as dependent or criterion variables, while the FIRO-B (Interpersonal Behaviors) dimensions were designated independent or predictor variables. Locus of control variables were also used as independent or predictor variables in these analyses. It is to be noted that Schutz's (1977) FIRO-B Scales are divided into six scales: (a) Expressed Inclusion; (b) Wanted Inclusion; (c) Expressed Control; (d) Wanted Control; (e) Expressed Affection; and (f) Wanted Affection. Multiple linear regression analyses (using 154 respondents) are listed in Tables 4 and 5.

FINDINGS

The findings of the correlational analyses for 154 respondents showed the following: (a) Expressed Inclusion Scales were statistically significant to eight LBDQ Scales, specifically, Representation, $p < .01$; Persuasion, $p < .05$; Predictive Accuracy, $p < .05$; Integration, $p < .01$; Superior Orientation, $p < .01$; Initiating Structure, $p < .05$; Consideration, $p < .05$; and Production Emphasis, $p < .01$

(b) The findings for 83 business administration majors showed Expressed Inclusion Scales as being statistically significant to eight LBDQ Scales, specifically, Representation, $p < .05$; Persuasion, $p < .05$; Predictive Accuracy, $p < .05$; Integration, $p < .05$; Superior Orientation, $p < .01$; Initiating Structure, $p < .05$; Consideration, $p < .05$; and Production Emphasis, $p < .01$. (c) The findings for 71 educational administration majors showed Expressed Inclusion Scales as being statistically significant to two LBDQ Scales, specifically, Integration, $p < .01$; and Superior Orientation, $p < .05$. It is to be noted that all of the stated statistically significant relationships involving Expressed Inclusion Scales were positive. The findings for the 154 respondents and 83 business administration majors indicated that Expressed Inclusion was a powerful predictor of leader behaviors.

The findings involving Wanted Inclusion Scales showed the following: (a) When the 154 respondents were used, the stated Scales were statistically significant to four LBDQ Scales, specifically, Representation, $p < .01$; Integration, $p < .05$; Tolerance of Freedom, $p < .056$; and Consideration, $p < .01$; (b) When the 83 business administration majors were used, the stated Scales were statistically significant to eight LBDQ Scales, specifically, Representation, $p < .01$; Reconciliation, $p < .01$; Persuasion, $p < .01$; Predictive Accuracy, $p < .01$; Integration, $p < .01$; Superior Orientation, $p < .01$; Consideration, $p < .01$; and Production Emphasis, $p < .01$; (c) When the 71 educational administration majors were used, the Wanted Inclusion Scales were not statistically significant to any of the 12 LBDQ Scales. The findings for the 83 business administration majors indicated that Wanted Inclusion was a powerful predictor of leader behaviors.

Correlational analyses involving Expressed Control Scales showed the

following: (a) When the 154 respondents were used, the stated Scales were statistically significant to five LBDQ Scales, specifically, Representation, $p < .05$; Persuasion, $p < .056$; Predictive Accuracy, $p < .056$; Tolerance of Uncertainty, $p < .05$; and Consideration, $p < .05$. It is to be noted that the statistically significant relationships between Expressed Control Scales and leader behaviors of Tolerance of Uncertainty and Consideration were inverse; (b) When the 83 business administration majors were used, the stated Scales were statistically significant to four LBDQ Scales, specifically, Representation, $p < .05$; Predictive Accuracy, $p < .01$; Superior Orientation, $p < .056$; and Tolerance of Uncertainty, $p < .05$. The statistically significant relationship between Expressed Control Scales and Tolerance of Uncertainty was inverse; (c) When the 71 educational administration majors were used, Expressed Control Scales were not statistically significant to any of the 12 LBDQ Scales. The findings for Expressed Control indicated that this interpersonal behavior was not as distinct among the respondents of the study as Expressed Inclusion. Thus, Expressed Control cannot be identified as a powerful predictor of leader behaviors for the samples in the study.

The findings involving Wanted Control Scales showed the following: (a) When the 154 respondents were used, the stated Scales were statistically significant to five LBDQ Scales, specifically, Reconciliation, $p < .01$; Persuasion, $p < .01$; Role Assumption, $p < .01$; Predictive Accuracy, $p < .05$; and Superior Orientation, $p < .05$. It is to be noted that all five statistically significant relationships between Wanted Control Scales and the stated LBDQ Scales were inverse; (b) When the 83 business administration majors were used, the stated Scales were statistically significant to one LBDQ Scale, specifically, Consideration, $p < .05$. This statistically significant relationship was positive; (c) When the 71 educational administration majors

were used, the Wanted Control Scales were statistically significant to nine LBDQ Scales, specifically, Representation, $p<.05$; Reconciliation, $p<.05$; Persuasion, $p<.01$; Role Assumption, $p<.05$; Integration, $p<.05$; Superior Orientation, $p<.05$; Tolerance of Uncertainty, $p<.01$; Initiating Structure, $p<.01$; and Consideration, $p<.05$. It is to be noted that all nine statistically significant relationships between Wanted Control Scales and the stated LBDQ Scales were inverse. The findings for the 83 business administration majors indicated that Wanted Control was not a predictor of leader behaviors; however, Wanted Control was a powerful predictor of leader behaviors for the 71 educational administration majors. When the entire sample of 154 respondents were used, the Wanted Control Scales were only moderate predictors of leader behaviors.

Correlational analyses involving Expressed Affection Scales showed the following: (a) When the 154 respondents were used, the stated Scales were statistically significant to four LBDQ Scales, specifically, Representation, $p<.01$; Integration, $p<.01$; Superior Orientation, $p<.05$; and Consideration, $p<.05$. All four statistically significant relationships were positive; (b) When the 83 business administration majors were used, the stated Scales were statistically significant to three LBDQ Scales, specifically, Representation, $p<.05$; Integration, $p<.05$; and Superior Orientation, $p<.05$. All three statistically significant relationships were positive; (c) When the 71 educational administration majors were used, the stated Scales were statistically significant to one LBDQ Scale, specifically, Integration, $p<.056$. The one statistically significant relationship was positive. The findings for Expressed Affection indicated that this interpersonal behavior was not a predictor for the leader behaviors of any of the samples used in the study.

Interpersonal Behaviors and Leader Behaviors

Correlational analyses involving Wanted Affection Scales showed the following: (a) When the 154 respondents were used, the stated Scales were statistically significant to one LBDQ Scale, specifically, Consideration, $p<.05$; (b) When the 83 business administration majors were used, the Wanted Affection Scales were statistically significant to three LBDQ Scales, specifically, Reconciliation, p .05; Tolerance of Uncertainty, $p<.05$; and Consideration, $p<.05$; (c) When the 71 educational administration majors were used, the stated Scales were not statistically significant to any of the LBDQ Scales. Based on these findings for Wanted Affection, it is evident that these Scales were not a factor for any of the samples in the study.

Summarily, the findings in the study indicated the following: (a) Expressed interpersonal behaviors were better predictors for the leader behaviors of the total sample of 154 respondents than Wanted interpersonal behaviors. Thus, the total sample was inclined toward interpersonal behaviors which a person expresses toward others rather than interpersonal behaviors which a person wants from others; (b) Expressed interpersonal behaviors and Wanted interpersonal behaviors both contributed as predictors for the leader behaviors of the 83 business administration respondents with the Wanted Control Scales being the least productive of the six FIRO-B Scales; (c) The Wanted Control Scales were the most productive of the six FIRO-B Scales insofar as the 71 educational administration majors were concerned; however, it is to be noted that the nine statistically significant relationships between Wanted Control Scales and the stated LBDQ Scales were inverse; (d) Expressed Inclusion, Expressed Control, and Expressed Affection were not predictors for the leader behaviors of the 71 educational administration majors; (e) There were no statistically significant relationships between the FIRO-B Scales of Wanted Inclusion, Expressed Control, Wanted Affection and the 12 LBDQ Scales for the 71

educational administration majors.

A review of LBDQ Scales that were statistically significant indicated the following: (a) When the 154 respondents were used, Representation, Persuasion, Superior Orientation, Predictive Accuracy, Integration, and Consideration were the leader behaviors that appeared more than one time in statistically significant relationships; (b) When the 83 business administration majors were used, Representation, Persuasion, Superior Orientation, Production Emphasis, Reconciliation, Predictive Accuracy, Integration, Tolerance of Uncertainty, and Consideration appeared more than once in statistically significant relationships; (c) When the 71 educational administration majors were used, Superior Orientation and Integration were the leader behaviors that appeared more than one time in statistically significant relationships. It is to be noted that the data generated by the 83 business administration majors produced more statistically significant relationships than did the data generated by the 71 educational administration majors.

Multiple linear regression analyses using Initiating Structure and Consideration as dependent or criterion variables produced the following: (a) Using six FIRO-B Scales and three Locus of Control Scales as independent or predictor variables, Expressed Inclusion was identified as the best predictor of Initiating Structure for the 154 respondents. It is to be noted that when all three Locus of Control variables and six FIRO-B variables had entered the regression equation, Expressed Inclusion (Multiple R of 0.20; R Square of 0.04) was not statistically significant; (b) Wanted Control (Multiple R of 0.31; R Square of 0.09) was the third best predictor of Initiating Structure for the 154 respondents. Wanted Control was not statistically significant; (c) Wanted Inclusion (Multiple R of 0.34; R Square of 0.12) entered the regression equation last (ninth place), but Wanted Inclusion was statistically significant ($p < .05$); (d) Using six FIRO-B Scales and three Locus of Control Scales as independent or predictor variables,

Interpersonal Behaviors and Leader Behaviors

Wanted Inclusion (Multiple R of 0.21; R Square of 0.04) and Expressed Control (Multiple R of 0.31; R Square of 0.10), respectively, were identified as the best predictors of Consideration for 154 respondents; however, neither Scale was statistically significant after all nine predictor variables had entered the regression equation. Wanted Control (Multiple R of 0.37; R Square of 0.14) and Wanted Affection (Multiple R of 0.37; R Square of 0.14) were the eighth and nineth predictor variables to enter the regression equation. Each of these predictor variables was statistically significant ($p<.01$).

CONCLUSIONS

The findings in the study underscore the significance and utility of FIRO theory as a foundation for empirical investigation of leader behaviors (Schutz, 1977). FIRO theory postulates that every person has three interpersonal needs: inclusion, control, and affection. Schutz (1958, 1966) has stated that inclusion (the need of a person to establish and maintain a satisfactory relation with others with respect to interaction and association) in a group must occur before a person begins to provide for interpersonal needs of control and affection. The eight statistically significant relationships involving Expressed Inclusion (inclination of a person toward joining others and including others) and leader behaviors for 154 respondents verified Schutz's FIRO theory with respect to inclusion. Since the demographic information on business administration majors indicated that 80% of the respondents were pursuing Master of Business Administration degrees and only 27% were actually superiors/supervisors in organizations, it can be concluded that Expressed Inclusion was an urgent interpersonal need for business administration majors. On the other hand, Expressed Inclusion was not a significant interpersonal need for the educational administration majors whose demographic information showed

that 52% of the respondents were already participating in supervisory positions in organizations. Thus, it can be concluded from the findings that Expressed Inclusion was clearly significant for business administration majors, since at the time of the study a majority of the respondents had not yet entered the marketplace as business administrators. Further verification of the significance of inclusion for business administration majors was verified by eight statistically significant relationships involving Wanted Inclusion (inclination of a person to want to be included by others) and leader behaviors. The fact that Wanted Inclusion was clearly a significant interpersonal need among business administration majors underscored clearly the status of the majority of respondents. While the findings for Expressed Control, Wanted Control, Expressed Affection, and Wanted Affection for business administration majors were inconclusive, it can be concluded that the respondents were inclined toward Expressed Affection (interpersonal need that expresses a person's desire to have close relationships with people) and Wanted Affection (interpersonal need that expresses a person's want for others to act close to her/him). Schutz (1977) has stated that affection is the highest or most advanced of the three interpersonal needs; thus, the business administration respondents in the study were inclined toward an interpersonal need that indicated that the group was (a) engaged in professions that are concerned with people; and (b) socially well-balanced relative to affection needs. Since there was a positive statistically significant correlation between Wanted Affection and Consideration, a person-oriented leader behavior according to Stogdill (1963), it was concluded that the business administration respondents were inclined toward people-oriented characteristics.

The findings concerning the 71 educational administration respondents were

not productive in terms of statistically significant correlations. Conclusions similiar to those made for the business administration respondents cannot be made for the educational administration respondents. It is to be noted that there were nine statistically significant relationships involving Wanted Control and LBDQ Scales. The relationships (which were inverse) were interpreted to mean that the educational administration respondents did not want to be controlled by others. This inclination away from control was an indication that the educational administration respondents were preparing for or engaged in a profession that is highly interactive with people or various publics. Thus, they preferred to remain independent.

Relative to leader behaviors, it is to be noted that any conclusions must be made within Stogdill's (1963) framework of system-oriented leader behaviors and person-oriented leader behaviors. The 83 business administration majors were inclined toward the system-oriented leader behaviors of Representation and Superior Orientation. The fact that the business administrators in the study were (a) interested in being spokespersons for their group and (b) concerned with keeping cordial relations with the superiors in their group matches and reinforces the conclusions made about the group relative to the interpersonal needs of inclusion and affection. On the side of person-oriented leader behaviors, business administrators were inclined toward the leader behavior of Consideration, which means they were interested in the comfort, well-being, status, and contribution of their followers. This inclination toward Consideration verifies the conclusion made previously that the business administration respondents in the study were engaged in professions that are concerned with people. Summarily, the correlational findings for business administration majors showed that the group was a system-person oriented group in terms of both interpersonal behaviors and leader behaviors. They were concerned with institutional needs (questions of effective-

ness according to Barnard) as well as individual needs (questions of efficiency according to Barnard). Similar conclusions cannot be made for the educational administration respondents in the study. However, it is to be noted that when the entire sample of 154 respondents was used for correlational analyses, they illustrated system-person oriented leader behaviors. The entire sample was inclined toward the interpersonal need of inclusion. The latter finding verifies the fact that the 154 respondents in the study were engaged in the preparation phases of their professions; they had not yet achieved fulltime entry into the marketplaces of their professions. Thus, issues of control (as identified by Expressed Control and Wanted Control) were not significant to them.

The investigators believe that the findings that emanated from the data were outcomes of the instruments used in the study. Interpersonal behaviors were measured by Schutz's (1977) FIRO-B Scales. The 54 item questionnaire which yields six scale scores in two categories, Expressed Behavior and Wanted Behavior, has satisfactory reliability and validity. The Instrument has been used widely for research purposes in a variety of fields. On the other hand, Stogdill's (1963) LBDQ Scales while having acceptable internal consistency reliability have marginally acceptable content validity, unknown construct validity, and unknown convergent and discriminate validity. For the relationships specified in the study, it was apparent that the area in which further research is needed is in the refinement of the psychometric properties of Stogdill's (1963) LBDQ-XII Scales. Although the late Professor Stogdill consented to factor and cluster analyses of the Scales, the instrument requires additional factor analyses using various populations of leaders. The investigators recommend (a) the use of a second-order factor analyses; and (b) more specifically,

the use of initial factor analysis as specific ways of refining the LBDQ-XII Scales.

Stogdill (1963) and Halpin (1966) have stated that one of the significant outcomes of the Ohio State Leadership Studies is that the leader behaviors of Initiating Structure and Consideration are fundamental dimensions of leader behavior. It is to be noted that the findings in the study did not support the stated conclusion. While the 83 business administration respondents were inclined toward Consideration, a person-oriented leader behavior, it is to be noted that neither the business administration majors nor the educational administration majors were inclined toward Initiating Structure. The investigators concluded that to expect business administrators and educational administrators to espouse the leader behavior of Initiating Structure would de facto involve their removal from positions of leadership that require their interactions with various publics.

Bibliography

Barnard, C. I. The functions of the executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Guilford, J. P., & Frutcher, B. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Halpin, A. Theory and research in administration. New York: Macmillan, 1966.

Schutz, W. C. FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Schutz, W. C. Leaders of schools: FIRO theory applied to administrators. LaJolla, Calif.: University Associates, 1977.

Schutz, W. C. The FIRO scales manual. Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1978.

Stogdill, R. M. Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research. New York: The Free Press, 1974.

Stogdill, R. M. Manual for the leader behavior description questionnaire: Form XII, an experimental revision. Columbus: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1963.

APPENDIX

Table 1

Correlational Matrix
FIRO-B & LBDQ Scales
154 Respondents
(only statistically significant r's are listed)

	COLUMN/12 LBDQ SCALES											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
FEI	0.22 *** 0.006		0.16 ** 0.042		0.19 ** 0.019	0.29 *** 0.000	0.29 *** 0.000		0.20 ** 0.011		0.19 ** 0.021	0.22 *** 0.005
FWI	0.21 *** 0.008					0.20 ** 0.013				0.16 * 0.054	0.21 *** 0.008	
FEC	0.17 ** 0.039		0.16 * 0.052		0.16 * 0.054			-0.16 ** 0.050			-0.17 ** 0.031	
FWC		-0.22 *** 0.007	-0.22 *** 0.006	-0.29 *** 0.000	-0.18 ** 0.025		-0.17 ** 0.034					
FEA	0.21 *** 0.008					0.25 *** 0.002	0.16 ** 0.041				0.17 ** 0.037	
FWA											0.18 ** 0.029	

Note. Six FIRO-B Scale Names: FEI, Expressed Inclusion; FWI, Wanted Inclusion; FEC, Expressed Control; FWC, Wanted Control; FEA, Expressed Affection; FWA, Wanted Affection.

* p<.056
** p<.05
*** p<.01

Table 2

Correlational Matrix
FIRO-B & LBDQ Scales
83 B AD Respondents
(only statistically significant r's are listed)

	COLUMN/12 LBDQ SCALES											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
FEI	0.24 ** 0.031		0.24 ** 0.031		0.23 ** 0.034	0.25 ** 0.022	0.34 *** 0.001		0.22 ** 0.046		0.22 ** 0.043	0.28 *** 0.009
FWI	0.29 *** 0.008	0.34 *** 0.002	0.31 *** 0.005		0.32 *** 0.003	0.34 *** 0.002	0.30 *** 0.006				0.28 *** 0.010	0.34 *** 0.002
FEC	0.22 ** 0.041				0.28 *** 0.010		0.21 * 0.052	-0.24 ** 0.032				
FWC											0.22 ** 0.043	
FEA	0.27 ** 0.012					0.27 ** 0.014	0.26 ** 0.017					
FWA		0.22 ** 0.043						0.24 ** 0.032			0.23 ** 0.035	

Note. Six FIRO-B Scale Names: FEI, Expressed Inclusion; FWI, Wanted Inclusion; FEC, Expressed Control; FWC, Wanted Control; FEA, Expressed Affection; FWA, Wanted Affection.

* $p < .056$
** $p < .05$
*** $p < .01$

Table 3

Correlational Matrix
FIRO-B & LBDQ Scales
71 EDAD Respondents
(only statistically significant r's are listed)

	COLUMN/12 LBDQ SCALES											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
FEI						0.34 *** 0.003	0.24 ** 0.040					
FWI												
FEC												
FWC	-0.24 ** 0.042	-0.27 ** 0.021	-0.31 *** 0.009	-0.30 ** 0.012		-0.29 ** 0.013	-0.26 ** 0.030	-0.34 *** 0.003	-0.41 *** 0.000		-0.24 ** 0.047	
FEA						0.23 * 0.054						
FWA												

Note. Six FIRO-B Scale Names: FEI, Expressed Inclusion; FWI, Wanted Inclusion; FEC, Expressed Control; FWC, Wanted Control; FEA, Expressed Affection; FWA, Wanted Affection.

* $p < .056$
** $p < .05$
*** $p < .01$

Table 4

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis
Criterion Variable: Initiating Structure
Predictor Variables: LC & FIRO-B Scales
154 Respondents

Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R Square	b[a] coefficient	Beta[b] coefficient
Expressed Inclusion	0.20	0.04	0.48	0.24
Chance	0.26	0.07	0.07	0.10
Wanted Control	0.31	0.09	-0.36	-0.17
Powerful Others	0.32	0.10	0.10	0.13
Wanted Affection	0.33*	0.11	-0.15	-0.08
Expressed Control	0.33*	0.11	-0.09	-0.06
Internal	0.34*	0.11	0.06	0.05
Expressed Affection	0.34*	0.11	0.09	0.05
Wanted Inclusion	0.34*	0.12	-0.04	-0.03
(Constant)[c] coefficient			34.76	

[a] b coefficient refers to the extent to which each variable is utilized in the overall regression equation, but it is scaled in terms of raw scores.

[b] Beta coefficient refers to the extent to which each variable is utilized in the overall regression equation.

[c] (Constant) coefficient is part of the multiple regression equation and ensures that the mean of the predicted values coincides with the mean of the obtained values.

* $p < .05$.

Table 5

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis
Criterion Variable: Consideration
Predictor Variables: LC & FIRO-B Scales
154 Respondents

Predictor Variables	Multiple R	R Square	b coefficient	Beta coefficient
Wanted Inclusion	0.21	0.04	0.22	0.18
Expressed Control	0.31	0.10	-0.37	-0.25
Internal	0.35*	0.12	0.16	0.15
Expressed Inclusion	0.36*	0.13	0.16	0.09
Chance	0.37**	0.14	-0.04	-0.05
Expressed Affection	0.37**	0.14	0.10	0.06
Powerful Others	0.37**	0.14	-0.03	-0.04
Wanted Control	0.37**	0.14	0.03	0.01
Wanted Affection	0.37**	0.14	0.02	0.01
(Constant) coefficient			35.97	

*$p<.05$

**$p<.01$